ಶ್ರೀ ಕಾಗೋಡು ತಿಮ್ಮಪ್ಪ.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸಿ. ಒ. ಡಿ. ಕಳಿಸಿ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನನಗೆ ಬಿಡಿ. Please hear me. Why are y ou so much worried ?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—We agree. There are hundreds of people who have seen it. Case is not registered under section 302. ಅಲ್ಲಗೆ ಸಿ. ಒ. ಡಿ. ಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಿ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು.

Cauvery Water Distribution issue

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ. (ಹೊಳೇನರಸಿಪುರ) —ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷಣಿಯವರೇ, ಕಾವೇರಿ ಜಲ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟಿಂಥ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಇದೆ ಅದು ವಿಫಲಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ತತ್‌ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನರ್‌ಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೂಡ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ನಿಲುವು ತಳೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಬಿನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 11·2 ಟಿ. ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಎಫ್ ಟಿ, ಅಷ್ಟು ನೀರನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1924ರ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನು ಬಾಹಿರವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನೀರನ್ನು ರೀಲೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎಡವಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 5 ಟಿ. ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಎಫ್. ಟಿ. ಅಷ್ಟು ನೀರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇದು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೊಯಿನಾಡಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಬರಗಾಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಆರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಯಿನಾ ನೀರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ 14ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಗಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟೆವು. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಗಾಲ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ; ಆದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. We have actually purched water by paying 14 lakhs of rupees. ಕೊಯಿನಾಡಿಂದ ನೀರು ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನ ಅದರ ಫಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತು 5 ಟಿ: ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಎಫ್. ಟಿ. ಯಷ್ಟು ನೀರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್ ಬಂದಾಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಇವತ್ತು ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನರ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು, ಎರಡನೆಯದು 11 ಟಿ. ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಎಫ್. ಟಿ. ನೀರು ಕಬಿನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ರಿಲೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಡವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು. ಕಾವೇರಿ ಜಲ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿವೆ ? ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು 'ಇಂಡಿಸ್' ಪ್ರೋಸ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಇಂಡಿಸ್‌ಪ್ರೋಸ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಚಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿದೆ ? ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಅಘಾತವಾದೀತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಶಂಕೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. I expect a statement from the Government, particularly on this vital issue. Everybody is interested in this particular issue.

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair)

3-30 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ (ಅರಕಲಗೂಡು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗತಾನೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಕಾವೇರಿ ಜಲದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು

ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂತೂ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಮಾತುಕಥೆ ಮುರಿದುಬಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೋ ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಾಗಿ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡು ಯಾವತ್ತಿಗೂ 'ತಾ' ಮಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದವರು 'ತಕೋ' ಮಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಬಿನಿ ಜಲಾಶಯ ದಿಂದ 5 ಟಿ.ಎಂ ಸಿ.ಎಫ್ ಟಿ. ನೀರನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಬಿನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ನೀರು 102 ಟಿ.ಎಂ ಸಿ ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ 13 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ.ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು 89 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ಎಫ್ ಟಿ. ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 13 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ಯಲ್ಲಿ 5 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಒಟ್ಟು 94 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ.ಎಫ್.ಟಿ ನೀರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೋದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಯಿತು. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಮೂರು ಟಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ.ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ನೀರು ಬಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅಸತ್ಯ ವಾತಾ ವರಣವನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಮಾಡಿ, ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ನೀರು ಹೋದ ಕಾರಣವಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ನನಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಂಟುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸರಳ ಹೃದಯರಾದ, 'ತಕೋ' ಮಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಜನ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ, ಸದುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ 5 ಟಿ.ಎಂ.ಸಿ.ಎಫ್.ಟಿ. ನೀರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟಿತು. ನಾವು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಹನೆಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದಂಥ, ಸರಳವಾದ, ಸತ್ಯವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದಂಥ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ನದ್ಯಾವನೆಗಳೇ ನಮಗೆ ಶಾಪ ವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಣಮಿಸುತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ಬಹುಶಃ ಈಗ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನವರ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನಾವರೂ ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮಾತುಕಥೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ವಿಫಲವಾಗಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಸಕಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಬಹುಶಃ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನವರೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾಗಿ ಕಾರಣರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತತ್ವತಃ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಹುಕುಂ ಹೊರಡಿ ಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ದಿನವಾಯಿತು. ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿ, ಸಮಿತಿ ಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ತದನಂತರ ಅವರ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತ್ರಿಪಕ್ಷೀಯವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಯಾದಮೇಲೆ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳು ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ನೂರು ತಮಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಪಸು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಇಂಥ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಇಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವರದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನವರು ಏನು ಬೆಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಮೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ ಫೈಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪಟೇಲ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಗಳೇನಿವೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಟನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಆ ವರದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಆ ವರದಿಗಳು ಇರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನವರ ವರಸೆ 'ತಾ, ತಾ' ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಆರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲಾದರೂ 1974ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮುಗಿಯಿತು, 1924ರ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಇನ್‌ವ್ಯಾಲಿಡೇಟಾಗಿದೆ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆ, ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಪೋರ್ಷನಲ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರಪೋರ್ಷನ್ ಇವು ಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಸಾಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಸ್ಥಳ ಬಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಹಿಂದಿನ ರೂಲ್ ಆಫ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಅನುಸರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಏನು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿರಾಕರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವು ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೇ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಹೇಗೆ? ಮುಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ? ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೊಡನೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Members are aware that the Government of India in their search

for a solution in this long pending dispute on the Kaveri Waters, quite a long time, have been summoning the Chief Ministers of all States for a discussion across the table. At some stage, there was an agreement that a Committee should be constituted to collect all data and place it before them for consideration. That was also done. Subsequently, some further details were needed. The same Committee collected those details and at the time when these datas are available; the Chief Ministers' Conference decided that an independent Officer, Mr. Patil Committee should be appointed to get some further details in regard to the actual availability and utilisation and whether any savings could be effected by moderisation of irrigation management. That was also done. You are aware Sir, that the Chief Minister after going through the proposed draft agreement made a categorical statement that it would not be accepted. He also made it clear time and often that under no circumstances would the Government conciede if that would make permanent injury to the interest of Karnataka State. So, I would like to assure this House that the Government will not yield to anything which will anyway injure the interest of the State. This is the life and death question of the State. Because, as all of you know, the Krishna and Cauvery are the live rivers on which the economic development of the State depends upon. I do not want to go into the details because, it is very complicated one. Detailed information could be had from the Chief Minister who is coming in a day or two. He will take the appropriate time to apprise you all about the latest position that has happened there.

Anyway the Press reports are before us. The Chief Minister of Tamilnadu has made certain statement and the Leader of the Opposition and also Mr. Nanje Gowda have drawn my attention to some of the statements made. To say that Karnataka has violated 1924 Agreement, and by such violation it has impounded 11.4 TMCFT of water in Kabini Reservoir, I should only say that it amounts to the saying– Kettle calling the pot black. If at all anybody violated the Agreement, the country knows and the world knows that it is the Tamilnadu that has developed irrigation in 4.97 lakhs acres in violation of the agreement and appropriated 97.5 TMCFT of water which should have gone to the divisible pool, and Karnataka impounding 11.4 TMCFT of water is clearly within the scope of 1924 Agreement. Across Bhavani and Amaravathi very nicely they have constructed projects and utilised about 50 TMCFT of water. We have got right upto 30–50 per cent of the offset Reservoir. Such offset reservoir shall be of the capacity of 30 TMCFT which will be 50 per cent of their impounding. The Chief Minister of a State, to say that Karnataka has violated the agreement and impounded 11.4 TMCFT water, I am only sorry that it amounts to 'kettle calling the pot black'.

Secondly, it is Karnataka which has been subjected to injury. There are three basin States here. If at all any State suffered injustice from quite a long time, it is Karnataka. It is the Karnataka State

which has suffered injury. It has to find solution in a Court of law. Instead of that, Tamilnadu, which has enjoyed the lion share of water going to a Court of law, is rather surprising for me. This is not the first time they are making a statement. They have already said and also gone to a Court of law. Sometime back, if I remember correct, Tamilnadu did approach Supreme Court on two grounds praying for an order of injunction. (1) To stay the construction of any projects and stop work in Karnataka State that was rejected by the Supreme Court. And later on I do not know for what reasons Tamilnadu withdrew the application from the Tribunal which are best known to the hon'ble Members. These are the points on which my attention was specifically drawn to. Now, I would only say that there are several approaches to this problem. There are 3-4 approaches to this problem and one such approach has been made according to the paper report, which has been failed. There are several other approaches also to this problem. It is always best that river water dispute is settled by mutual agreement and this kind of arrangement will give better dividends to all the basin States. But if contention approach becomes inevitable on account of the uncompromising attitude of the other States, well, then it has to be taken as a course of last resort. I must submit to this House and through this House to the country that Karnataka has always been very co-operative in their approach right from the beginning. They have never gone against in any manner at any time. History of the Cauvery if only read in details, hon. Members will appreciate that it is the old Mysore that has been subjected to all sorts of restrictions for their enjoyment of the fair share in the Cauvery water. It is a matter of common knowledge that not only our State, the whole country knows that Karnataka has not been fairly treated in the past and Karnataka would not like to be treated in the same manner hereafter. Karnataka being a basin State, it has a right for rightful share. How that rightful share has to be determined is a matter of details to which I don't want to enter at this moment. Tamilnadu is also aware, I am sure, aware of going into the Court of law. They are also aware about the negotiation to come to a settlement on the basis of 1924 agreement or on the basis of immediate need or equitable allocation basis. They are aware of all those approaches. They are also very clever people. I should admit it. I must say at this time that not only Karnataka and Tamilnadu, but all basin States must understand one principle. No State has a moral or legal right to ask for water for its own use until and unless it has used and exhausted all the water available in their territory including alternative sources of underground and wastage water.

Tamil Nadu knows it. It knows that unless they exhaust all the resources available in their own State, they have no moral or legal right to ask another State to make good the water for their benefit. It is only after they make use of the available resources, if they are still in trouble there is some justification to them to ask for water from

another State. As all of you know and as the Committee has re orted there is ample underground water in the delta. The U.N.D.P. has estimated it at 178 T.M.C. ft. Even though all of it cannot be exploited at least 50 to 60% could be exploited which would amount to 125 T.M.C. ft. They must make use of it first before they ask us to provide water. The Committee itself has reported that as much as 50 T.M.C. ft. is going waste to the sea, It is their duty to prevent that to the extent possible. I do not say that all of it should be saved. At least 50 to 60% could be saved and utilised. They will have to adopt scientific management of water to meet the needs of 28 lakhs of acres there. After doing all this, if still they are in trouble I can understand there is some justification in asking either Kerala or Karnataka to provide water. Keeping all this secret in their own pocket and asking for more water so that they might later on utilise all this when they get the maximum share from the other States, to say the least, it would be unfair and it would not be correct.

There is also another point which Tamil Nadu is aware and what is that ? Any one of the basin States cannot exercise a right of veto to the development of the other States. Who has given the right of veto ? Under all laws pertaining to water disputes, the basic law is that every State has the right to utilise its own water within its territory without causing any injury to another State or by causing the least injury to another State. But here is a cause where very serious injury is being caused to the development of Karnataka. Can it ever be countenanced by anybody who has a sense of justice ? No. There is also one thing which every State has got to know and I am sure Tamil Nadu knows it, being a lower riparian State. It is not possible for any State to carry water management satisfactorily and peacefully unless it carries with it the goodwill and co-operation of the other States. If I think that I can carry on water management in Karnataka without the co-operation of Kerala, probably that will be a most incorrect approach. Similarly, if Tamil Nadu thinks that it can by a contentious approach carry on water management according to its own whims and fancies without the active and willing co-operation and support of the other States, it would be an impossibility. That also Tamil Nadu must know. That is why I said that instead of a contentious approach it would always be best to settle matters across the table and have a live and let live policy. If Tamil Nadu approaches with a live and let live policy, I am sure according to my calculations we can find water to meet the minimum needs of the three basin States *viz.*, Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu. All that is required is a live and let live policy, a co-operative approach and an approach to do the least injury to the other riparian States. These are all some of the broad principles which anybody who has some interest or the other in a basin State has to keep in mind. The first attempt to come to an agreement has failed. Therefore, it is not as though the doors are closed. This is an arrangement made by the good offices of the Government of India to come to some kind of an agreement and as

paper report says Tamil Nadu itself has backed out on its own and does not agree to the figures. Merely because it has failed I do not rule out the possibility of further negotiations in the matter on the basis of other norms. There are nearly three or four ways of approach. One way has failed.

Sri KAGODU THIMMAPPA.—What are the other ways ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have already spelt them out. He was not attentive. One of them is on the basis of the 1924 agreement itself. Let us analyse the possibilities of reconsiderations and modifications under the relevant clause that is provided in the 1924 agreement. The second is the minimum needs basis. What is the minimum need for Tamil Nadu for 28 lakhs of acres, what is the minimum need for 6.8 lakh acres here and what is the minimum need for Kerala ? After this we will find what water will be available and that water will have to be made available to the upper riparian State. That will have to be examined. That is the minimum needs basis. The third approach is what we call the fair and equitable allocations which will have to be made on the basis of basin factors.

Sri KAGODU THIMMAPPA.—By whom ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—We have to sit and discuss these matters with the assistance of the Government of India.

A fair and equitable basis is always done on basin factors. I need not detail what the basin factors are. Roughly, the population depending on the water, the area of irrigation developed, cultural area, areas incidental to famine. All these factors come in to play. Considering all the basin factors, we will prescribe what is legitimately due to each one of them equitably. Once we determine the percentage of apportionable water, then it will have to be distributed amongst the three States. Each State will have to utilise that percentage in the manner it deems fit. Therefore, merely because it is reported that the talks have failed, we need not be worried. We have other methods of negotiations. We will make use of the good offices of the Government of India and try to evolve a formula by which we will stand to benefit, the Tamilnadu gets its rightful share and Kerala also gets its share. Sri Karunanidhi, Chief Minister of Tamilnadu, has forgotten that he had already gone to the Court.

4 00 P. M.

Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA.—I rise on a point of order. Sri H. M. Channabasappa is talking about the failure of the agreement in Delhi. Sri Devaraj Urs, Chief Minister, is still in Delhi. He has to come and make a statement. Before he comes and makes a statement, I do not see the relevance of Sri Channabasappa's statement on Cauvery waters.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have already stated that the Chief Minister will come and make a statement. It is reported that the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu has stated that it will go to court, I only said that there are opportunities open and it is not as if we have exhausted all alternatives and we have no other means. There are methods to negotiate and arrive at an agreement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No one disputes the seriousness of the issue nor the importance of the waters to the State. The Minister on behalf of the Government is giving a reply.

Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA.—He is not the Minister in charge of the portfolio.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Chief Minister will come and make a statement and everybody knows that whenever this issue was to be discussed the Government has taken into confidence all the members of the Opposition. I think the issue can be left at that. There should be no doubts. If details are to be given, so many doubts will be raised. We have got a lot of business to be completed. Please help me.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about it only with a view to get certain things clarified to allay fears that are there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I can understand. The importance of the issue is never under estimated. An assurance has been given on behalf of the Government. Again the Chief Minister will make a statement. The Leader of the Opposition will be taken into confidence as usual. I think the matter may be left at that. Let us take legislative Bills.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Hon. Minister does not seem to have completed the statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He told me that he has completed.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The final word is that there is scope for negotiations.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—He mentioned four approaches. May we know whether these four approaches have already been exhausted or broached with the various States and to what extent each approach has meterialised or not materialised and at what stage we are? This is most important.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Please don't go into other details.

Sri S. M. SHIRNALY CHANDRASEKHAR.—Just a clarification.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have closed the matter.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—With due respects to you, supposing more doubts arise after the statement of the hon. Minister are we not entitled to get clarifications? This is in important matter affecting the interests of the State.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have listened. No member need have any doubt at all. The Minister has stated that the Chief Minister will again make a statement. The matter is not closed. We will now go to legislative business. The Minister for Education may introduce the Bill

Mysore University (Extension of term of office of the members of the authorities) Bill, 1975—(*Introduction*)

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY (Minister for Education).—Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to introduce the Mysore University (Extension of term of office of the members of the authorities) Bill, 975.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Mysore University (Extension of term of office of the members of the authorities) Bill, 1975, is introduced **

Karnataka Private Educational Institutions (Discipline and Control) Bill, 1975 (*Motion to consider*)

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—I move:

"That the Karnataka Private Educational Institutions (Discipline and Control) Bill, 1975, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Karnataka Private Educational Instituations (Discipline and Control) Bill, 1975, be taken into consideration."

Sri H. D. DEVE GOWDA.—What about tle other Bills ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—There has been a little confusion. According to the decision taken by the Business Advisory Committee, we had to take up the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification and Scale of Pay of Non-Graduate Junior Engineers of the Public Works Department) Bill, 1975. Now we want this Karnataka Private Educational Insttutions Bill to be taken up. So, I want accommodation from the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೆಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಕಾಮಡೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ shall I conclude that the other Bill has been withdrawn by Government ?

** Bill appended as Annexure to this Volume.